7

PAPAL

ANTIQUITY AND SUPREMACY

— TREATED OF IN REFERENCE TO —

ARCHBISHOP LYNCH'S LECTURES,

(*Published in the Toronto Globe*)

Inscribed to the Members of L.O.L. No. 166,

BY G. EVANS, M. A.
(*Hon. Chaplain*).

Oakville:
PRINTED AT THE EXPRESS CHEAP BOOK AND JOB OFFICE.
1875.

The religious aspect of the times, and the unchecked advance of Ritualism, evincing a tendency to Popery, rendering it important that loyal Christians should fully comprehend the nature of those debasing and anti-christian principles, against which their forefathers protested,—the following brief essay, is intended to show how far the Roman Catholic Church has seceded from the faith of the the apostolic age, especially with relation to that system of demonolatry, which St. Paul prophetically defines as the characteristic of the "latter times" apostasy—1. *Tim.* i. 4.

PAPAL

ANTIQUITY AND SUPREMACY.

"A THOUSAND TIMES," as Archbishop Lynch truly affirms has it been asserted that the Church of Rome takes her doctrinal origin from the first century of the Christian era, and a thousand times has that assertion been refuted, by men as eminent for their knowledge of history as they were learned in the doctrine and theology of the primitive church. Again, a "*thousand times*" has it been asserted that the Roman Pontiff claims a supremacy over the whole commonwealth of Christendom, by right of a delegated authority to the apostle St. Peter, as Vicar of Christ, and through Peter by right of succession, to the Popes of Rome; and a thousand times has that claim been disputed and disproved, as utterly groundless and untenable.

It would be a work of great supererogation now to enter into a recapitulation of the "*thousand times*" repeated arguments, which have gone to prove the futility of those assertions; assertions, which in the face of historical records and known teaching of the primitive Church, Roman Catholics put forth and industriously circulate in their lectures, and through the medium of the public prints. 1. Now a church whose ecclesiastical constitution was not fully established until the pontificate of Pius the Fourth, 1564, can have but slender grounds to

compete with a Church planted under the presidency and supervision of the twelve apostles, who on the day of Pentecost received gifts commensurate with the great work they were commissioned to perform, that of giving to the world (in full) all the essential elements of the Christian religion, unincumbered by extraneous and vain traditions.

The creed of Pius the Fourth is now the acknowledged summary of the doctrines which form the ecclesiastical polity of the Papal Church, but if we look a few centuries backward, we find the introduction of rites and ceremonies utterly unknown to the Primitive Church, unless as eventualities predicted of the "latter times," and prophetically communicated by St. Paul to Timethy, in the following remarkable words :—

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrine of demons ; speaking lies in hypocracy ; forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats."

This prophetical language may require some explanation. About the time of Julian the Apostate, many superstitious tales were spread abroad of great wonders shown to those who approached the shrines of the martyrs and prayed at their sepulchres; through such delusions and lying wonders began the deifying of departed saints ; invocating them as mediators and adoring their relics. These newly introduced rites continued to obtain credence, thus changing the whole contexture of the primitive Church, and subverting the very basis of the Gospel religion. The innovations thus introduced had a more general acceptance at a later period, and are thus graphically described by the pen of the historian:—

"The Christians of the seventh century had insensibly relapsed into a semblance of paganism; their public and private vows were addressed to the relics and images that disgraced the temples of the east; the throne of the Almighty was darkened by a crowd of martyrs and saints; the Virgin Mary was invested with the name and honours of a goddess; the saints and martyrs whose intercession was implored were seated at the right hand of God; the devout Christian prayed before the image of a saint, and the pagan rites of genuflexion, luminaries and insense stole into the Catholic Church."—*Gib. Decl. and Fall, Book* 9.

This historical portraiture of the Church of the seventh century is easily identified with the Church of the sixteenth century, as settled by the creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, (1564). The seventh article of that creed enjoins the worship of canonized saints and martyrs as it is thus expressed:—

"Likewise the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated, and that they offer up prayers for us, and their relics are to be had in veneration."

Here, then, if we turn to the primitive apostolic times, we in vain look for any record of the intervention of canonized saints and martyrs, as mediators and intercessors with God for us. The Church was then founded on the true faith of one God and one Mediator, "and other foundation can no man lay."

The Church of Rome, therefore, in acknowledging the creed of Pius the Fourth, as the basis of her religion, has manifestly departed from the faith of the apostolic age, and in her present constitution has no proper doctrinal or ecclesiastical antiquity. Let us now turn to the second thousand times repeated assertion—

The Supremacy of the Pope.

2. Archbishop Lynch and all Romanists are very express in claiming for the Roman Pontiff the extraordinary prerogative of being the sole and infallible successor of the Apostle Peter, whereby he (the Pope) holds supreme jurisdiction over all christendom. This doctrine of papal supremacy is affirmed in the tenth Art. of the creed of Pius the Fourth, thus :—

"I acknowledge the holy Catholic Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all Churches, and I promise true obedience to the Bishop of Rome successor to Peter Prince of the Apostles and Vicar of Jesus Christ."—10 *Art. creed Pius* iv.

The obedience demanded by this canon extended to matters civil and religious, and history reveals a dismal catalogue of inhuman cruelties and persecutions which followed the enforcement of so unwarrantable an enactment.

Archbishop Lynch in his lecture of January 11th, complains that the supremacy so established, was swept away at the reformation, yet it is still upheld as an inherent right of the Papal Church, furthermore by a decree of the Council of Trent, all the articles of the creed of Pius the Fourth, are made binding on pain of forfeiting salvation.

In referring to a tabular view of the encroachments and rise of Popery, it appears that the Roman Catholic religion was not established under an authorized Popedom until the beginning of the seventh century, when it rightly acquired the characteristic of the Pontificale or Papal Church in contradistinction to the Apostolic or Gospel Church. In the intermediate periods between the seventh and sixteenth centuries, many new doctrines were

added, and the Papacy continued to extend its influence by intolerance and persecution. The Popes and their legates assumed a high and imperial authority, and supremacy over all christian states, until checked by the glorious revolution, and timely advent in England of William Prince of Orange of pious and immortal memory; but the supremacy of the Papal Church, was rather usurped, until it received the sanction and impress of the canon law of the tenth Art. of the creed of Pope Pius, already referred to. Thus, therefore, the supremacy of the Pope, falsely asserted to emanate from St. Peter, is one of the most remarkable innovations of the Church of Rome, and, considered in the light of Gospel truth, is utterly discordant with the genius and spirit of Christ's religion. Little, therefore, need be said in refutation of this claim of Papal supremacy. Like the former, it has been a thousand times refuted; a thousand times has it been shewn that our Lord did not confer any superiority on Peter, giving him a presidency over the other apostles. It is likewise clear that no position of supremacy was accorded to Peter, or claimed by him, at the first Council held at Jerusalem, for the Council was not opened by him, nor was the decision of the Council pronounced by him, but by James, as president."

Archbishop Lynch is therefore driven to the necessity of resting his cause on the solitary though memorable words—"Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church." — Old and hackneyed as the argument founded upon these words may be, Dr. Lynch did not fail to avail himself of it in one of his recent lectures, reported in the Toronto Globe.—Speaking of what he calls *the old doctrines*, which were swept away at the Reformation, he says—"In the first

place, was swept away, the supremacy of the Pope—that is that the Pope is the successor of Peter and head of the Church—it was nothing new. Christ had said—'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church.'"

The Roman Fathers commonly used the Latin Vulgate, in which version Dr. Lynch may be more profoundly read than in the Greek original, wherein, in another of his lectures, he evinced some inaccuracy, but, as in all disputed texts, reference is mostly had to the original languages in which the words were either written or spoken, I will appeal to his Grace's more perfect acquaintance with the Latin tongue, and refer to the words as copied from the Greek into the Latin Vulgate now before me :—

"Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram, edificabo meam ecclesiam."

Although the two clauses of this sentence are connected by the preposition "et," the *sense* and *application* of each have no grammatical connection, and must therefore have reference to something before spoken, *Math.* xvi, but the persistency and frequency with which the sentence is paraded, with the object of asserting the supremacy of Peter, would lead to the supposition that Roman Catholics have great faith in their theory of reserve, that is the keeping back the whole counsel of God, as they do the open Bible, and that, on the point in question, they have in reserve, unknown to common grammarians, some extraordinary freak of syntax, or lusus grammaticæ whereby the two nouns "Petrus" and "petram," though in different cases, may be put in apposition, which would be as absurd as the interpretation sought to be affixed to the words is ungrammatical; for neither is the "edificabo meam ecclesiam" predicated of "Petrus," in the second person, but of "petram," in the third person; and so

exactly has a learned Bishop understood and expressed it, in his speech before the late Œcumenical Council, at Rome, wherein he cites the authority of the most eminent Fathers of antiquity, as opponents of the Roman interpretation of the sentence, and concludes in these words :—

"The holy Fathers, in the famous passage, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church," never understood that that the Church was built on Peter, super Petrum, but on the rock, super petram."—*Strossmeyer.*

But I will now advert to something a thousand times of higher interest than any dry grammatical argument, in the light of which the supremacy of Peter and of all Roman Pontiffs must be thrown into the veriest obscuration. It is very remarkable that in perfect coincidence with the words recorded by St. Matthew,—"and on this rock I will build my Church." The true God is in numerous places in the Old Testament designated a Rock. In Deuteronomy xxxii, He is four times referred to under that epithet, *e. g.*, "Jesurun forsook the God which made him, and lightly esteemed the rock of his salvation. Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten the God that formed thee." This affirmation is made in so many instances, it would take several pages to give the quotations. Passing, therefore over the numberless verses which speak to this import, come we to St. Peter and St. Paul. The former Apostle, who, as received in the Church of Rome, must be a paramount authority with Archbishop Lynch, will, I fear, if allowed to speak for himself, give small encouragement to his infallible successors' pretensions, nor will the language which he addressed to the Jewish con-

verts, add much stability to His Holiness in being, as Peter's successor, the foundation stone upon which the Church is built. What a monstrous egotist must Peter have been, if, when addressing the Jews after the following manner, he was merely speaking of himself, and asserting his own personal title to universal supremacy, and extolling himself as the fundamental basis upon which all their hopes were built.

It is worthy of remark that these two shining lights of the Gospel Church, quote the same passage from the prophet which speaks of Christ as a rock or foundation stone. "Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation.—*Isaiah* xxviii, 16.

As St. Peter was addressing the believing as well as the unbelieving Jews, he makes this enlargement on the Prophet's words :—"Unto you, therefore, which believe, He, (Christ) is precious, but unto them that disbelieve, the stone which the builders refused, the same is made head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling and rock of offence, even to them that stumble at the Word," etc.

It may, perhaps, be said that the scriptural passages here quoted are typical, and not pertinent to the question at issue, so much the worse for the Roman Pontiffs' assumed claim as successors to Peter, the supposed rock on which the Church is built, since the corollaries deducible from such typical language exclude Peter from any part in this question, whether as type or antitype.

St. Paul, in allusion to the rock at Rephidim, which on being smitten by the rod of Moses supplied the Israelites with water, expressly calls Christ the Rock, they all drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ—not that Christ was *per se* the

Rock, but that he was the antitype, or person prefigured or pointed to as the Rock or sure foundation of the Christian Church.

Thus, as the typical rock of Rephidim gave no water until it was smitten by the rod of Moses, in like manner Christ, the antitype was smitten on the cross, that from his side might proceed that sovereign stream of blood and water which is effectual to the salvation of His faithful people. Thus, again, as the typical rock, was smitten by the rod of Moses, so was Christ smitten by the rod of the law, the curses and penalties of which, for our transgressions were laid upon him: "For he was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquities."

Lastly, as a continued stream followed the Israelites from the smitten typical rock, so Christ, being smitten on the cross—a never-ceasing supply of living water is poured out on His Church, of which whosoever drinketh, it it shall be in him a well of water springing up into eternal lite." Here, then, the inspired scriptures in every part combine their testimony in ascribing the whole work of redemption to Christ alone—the author and finisher of our faith, the rock of our salvation, and the sure foundation upon which the whole fabric of the visible Church is built. Through His intercession alone, the blessings and co-operation of the Triune Godhead are through faith attainable, sanctification, justification, remission of sin, grace and mercy. How widely, therefore, does the Church of Rome depart from the faith, when she vainly seeks to supplement so great salvation, by calling to her aid the ritual of canonized saints, invocating the intercession of creatures like ourselves, pray-

ng before their images, and adoring and venerating their relics.

These rites of invocating the mediation of departed saints are a direct violation of scriptural precedent, which admits but one God and one mediator.

The Church of Pius the Fourth (being the Church of Rome) which commands such an anti-christian system of worship, defined by the apostle—"doctrine of demons, is not therefore built on the foundation of the prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner Stone. Therefore, the Church of Rome is not apostolic, neither can she be the "mother and mistress of all the Churches," since that claim rests upon the assumption that Peter was Bishop of Rome and Prince of all the Apostles; and this leads to the re-production of an old problem, which may be styled the "pons asinorum" of the Roman Church, viz.: the stubborn fact that Peter never was Bishop of Rome. It is even doubted whether he had ever been a resident of the *eternal* city of the Cæsars. Bishop Strossmeyer did not scruple to submit this proposition to the sense of the assembled prelates at the great Œcumenical Council. In his speech, from which I have already given an extract, he says—"St. Peter having been at Rome, my venerable brethren, rests only on tradition, but if he had been Bishop of Rome, how can you, from that Episcopate prove his supremacy?" Scaliger, one of the most learned of men, has not hesitated to say that Peter's episcopate and residence at Rome ought to be "classed with ridiculous legends." If, then, Peter's episcopacy, residence at Rome and vicarship are controverted facts, and that Peter never was Bishop of Rome, how can the Roman Pontiffs be Peter's successors?

It is not easy to dislocate history and scripture, but no records in either can be found on the side of Rome in this question.

I have dwelt on this point, because it has been the most obstinately contested and arrogantly asserted claim in the whole system of Romanism, and because it has led to the most despotic and arbitrary domination ever exercised by any christian potentate, lay or clerical.

Thus, this holy apostle St. Peter, this so-called Prince, this vicar of Jesus Christ, this rock upon which Roman Catholics build their Church, is made the unwilling author of grievous misrepresentations, falsehoods and wrongs in the Christian world. Again, as to the vexed passage—"On this rock I will build my Church," I will add but a few words. As the uniform style of the scriptures is in figurative language so their uniform design is to testify of Christ; the very first testimony we receive of him in the Bible is highly figurative, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head."—*Gen.* iii.

When therefore in conformity with this figurative, style, and in relation to the sinner's hope, the scriptures speak of a rock, as indicating an immovable and sure foundation, they naturally testify of Christ, therefore the passage in question issuing from His gracious lips, cannot have reference to any object inferior to himself, and therefore he spake of himself, when he said "on this rock I will build my Church," and the words which he uses in Math. viii. may be considered as a key to the passage, "whoso heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken unto a wise man that built his house upon a rock, and the rains descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house and it fell not, for it was founded on a rock."

The subjects proposed for consideration in this little treatise were the assumed antiquity of the Roman Church, and the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. It was the vulgar taunt of the Romanist, when boasting of his Church's antiquity, to say to the Protestant—"Where was your church before Luther?" and the obvious reply was—"In the Bible, where yours never was," but that reply can have little weight with the Romanist, who puts his faith more in tradition than in the inspired scriptures; but we can now give him the retort courteous by asking him where was his Church before Pope Pius the Fourth, and his creed—that creed which is declared to be the "*orthodox* faith, which all are bound to profess, and outside of which no one can be saved," contains twelve articles, every one of which, taken seriatim, is opposed to the truth of the Bible. Finally, with scripture and history as sure tests to try the doctrines of Romanism, and system of Papal worship, we are led to the conclusion in coincidence with St. Paul's delineations of the "latter times apostasy"—1 *Tim.* iv. 2, *Thess.* ii, that the Roman Church has departed from the faith, that she began so to depart in the times of the fourth century, and that through many intermediate innovations and superadded dogmas, at length completed her code of canon laws, her form of rites and ceremonies under the Pontificate of Pius the Fourth, in the sixteenth century, therefore in history, in scripture, in natural reason and in logic, the Roman Church has no apostolic antiquity, nor the Roman Pontiff supremacy of jurisdiction.